

Art of the Valpovo Castle

Through many years of eager art collecting, the noble families Hillebrand von Prandau and von Normann-Ehrenfels, during the two centuries of management of the Valpovo Estate (1721 – 1945), formed a valuable art collection. The fine arts heritage of the Prandau-Normann family in one of the most significant family art collections in Croatia today, and as such, it is an unavoidable segment of the holdings of all institutions within the project *Valpovo Landowners*. If we consider the size and the significance of both families, their influence, and the activities with which they indebted not only the people of Valpovo, Miholjac, and Osijek, but also all generations of the inhabitants of the great Valpovo Estate, the interest of explorers and travel writers for the history of the family while they were living in Valpovo is not surprising. Those first writings by Adolf Danhelovsky¹ and Franjo Kuhač², which are significant for the history of the family, are only tangentially related to their patronage activities in the area of art. Regardless of that, those records are very interesting, because the authors were contemporaries of the family, the records have been written in Valpovo, and there is no question that some members of the family were involved in the creation of that literary work, most of all Baron Anton Gustav Hillebrand von Prandau. After the political changes in the first half of the 20th century, the concept of nobility was viewed with some hostility, which lasted until the 1970s and the first scientific research by Igor Karaman³ about the history of the estate. It was followed by numerous publications and discussions about the history of the family, primarily from the residents of Valpovo – Damir Stanić, Dragan Milošević, Stjepan Najman, and others. At the same time, there was an increase in the interest for the fine arts heritage of the family, which was already kept at the Gallery (today Museum) of Fine Arts in Osijek. The first and the most significant records about the art collection of Valpovo landowners were definitely the records by Oto Švajcer⁴. Švajcer was the first to write extensively about the Valpovo art collection, placing the emphasis on artists and artistry. It was followed by scientific considerations by other researchers, primarily curators from the Gallery of Fine Arts. However, the first systematic listing, valorisation, and evaluation of (now museum) collections of noble families was not done before 2012, in the doctoral dissertations of Jasminka Najcer Sabljak⁵ and Marina Vinaj⁶. The contribution of Ljerka Perčić, who wrote about the topic on several occasions, it also significant for the study of the history

of the estate and the life on it. The exhibition project *Valpovo Landowners* is a continuation of the previous research about the family collection in the museum and archival institutions, it provides new considerations about the private family collection, and adds new information about the patronage activities of the family outside of the collection.

The people of Valpovo still like to talk about *their counts*. Very few of them can remember any of them, but the stories from those days are still told often. Barons Prandau and Counts Normann had the reputation of great patrons of the arts, donors, and benefactors, they supported the work of many foundations and associations, and accepted patronage of all the parishes in the Valpovo and Miholjac regions, as well as some institutions, primarily those of cultural nature. After they moved from Vienna, which at the time was one of the largest cities and cultural centres of the world, to the small, devastated Valpovo, the Prandau family brought the spirit of the Viennese elite. Valpovo landowners kept up with the trends and made sure that the estate was modernised regularly. They were organising the estate and kept it functioning, they built roads, schools, and churches, and the estate was very economically advanced – one of the few almost completely self-sustainable estates. Keeping up with the trends is also visible in the fine arts collection, which contains works by some of the greatest artists in the Monarchy at the time. At the Valpovo court, art (not exclusively fine arts) was highly regarded.

The art collections of Slavonian noble families are definitely significant, these works of art are some of the most significant segments in the holdings of the institutions that kept them after the confiscation in 1945.⁷ When determining the cultural and historical significance of those collections, the social and historical aspect of the period in which those artworks were created should be kept in mind. First of all, there is a discrepancy between the estates in the feudal social system in which the landowners (feudal lords) represent the rich elite that can, among other things, afford collecting valuable art. Collecting and owning art was a matter of prestige, art was a status symbol, which is why it was valuable. The *Valpovo Collection* mainly consists of imports, mostly from Vienna, and works by domestic artists started appearing in the collection in the second half of the 19th century, which matches the period when the awareness about Croatian national art was being created. All the noble

collections, including the private collection Prandau-Normann, mostly contain portraits of family members. The causes for ordering portraits were varied, they were commissioned to commemorate important family events or as a way to preserve the memory of a family member. Even Oto Švajcer tried to explain that the need to *immortalise oneself or any member of one's family has always existed and has always been alive. A portrait had no other purpose in those circles but to permanently preserve someone's likeness, to extend their life beyond its physical existence.*⁸ Art pieces from private collections, including the Valpovo Collection, were used to decorate the spaces in the castle and were not available to the wider public, they were only for a narrow circle of family friends, visitors of the residences. That is why they had no influence in the history of (Croatian) art and they could not affect the art in our area in any way. They were displayed and available to the public only after they entered the galleries and museums. Of course, some of the visitors were artists,⁹ but in general the art pieces from private collections of Valpovo landowners could not have an effect on the painters in the wider local area.

However, the significance of high-quality orders of art is not negligible, because they help us understand the taste of the family. Their habits and the lifestyle they led at the estate and around it certainly left a trace in the local community, which they also physically formed and built. The Valpovo landowners were very involved in life of the local community, but they maintained contact with larger urban centres (Vienna, Buda, Pest, Pecs, Zagreb, Osijek) by keeping up with the trends in the cultural focal points. Some of the artists from the *Valpovo Collection* were the most sought-after painters of their time. Private collections, as well as collecting in general, help us fill-in and complete the knowledge about the opus of certain artists, but also to better understand the owners. The landowners of Valpovo, Hillebrand von Prandau and von Normann-Ehrenfels, were very respected in the high circles of Central Europe and their history faithfully illustrates the possibilities and consequences of the actions of Central European nobility, of which they are a significant part in all aspects, even while they lived in Valpovo, to the local level, which they developed and where they maintained influence and power. Their art was, through the activities of KOMZA, nationalised and partly stored at the Museum of Slavonia in Osijek in 1945 (most of which was later separated as the Paintings Gallery, Museum of Fine Arts today), and another part of it remained in the castle and is a part of the permanent exhibition of the Valpovo Regional Museum today.¹⁰

Patrons, Artwork, and Artists of the Private Family Collection

The first owner of the Valpovo Estate, Petar II Antun Baron Hillebrand von Prandau, started a comprehensive renovation of the entire estate in the first years after he became its lord.¹¹ One of the first interventions was the reconstruction of the castle and the neglected chapel on the grounds.¹² The painting that the baron ordered for its altar, *Throne of Mercy* by Johann Michael Rottmayr (cat. no. 11, MLU), is one of the most significant orders of art by the family and one of the most representative art imports in this part of the Monarchy. Rottmayr was one of the most influential painters of the Viennese Baroque, and the painting from Valpovo was created in the year of his death. Considering the painter's advanced age at the moment the painting was created and his engagement with other orders, Oto Švajcer brought into question the painter's engagement and pointed out the style features that indicate that it was made by a workshop.¹³ The central axis of the composition of this painting is Christ dying on the cross carried by small *putti* at the bottom, and it is held at the top, by the beam of the cross held in his right hand, by the figure of God the Father. At the top, as a source of light, there is a hovering dove (Holy Spirit). Around the central composition axis there are thick clouds with protruding small cherub heads. The strongly emphasized central axis, standard in the depictions of the *Throne of Mercy*, is disrupted by God the Father. His likeness is moved slightly to the left, his right hand is holding the beam of the cross and his left hand is lifted up. It stands out by its monumental appearance, with the draperies widely wrapping the figure of God the Father and creating a strong figure with full and expressive volume. The figure of Christ is shown in the condition near death, calm and expressionless, with a very pale skin colour, as well as two small *putti* at the bottom of the crucifix. Earlier researches (primarily Švajcer, who was mentioned earlier) have pointed out the lack of high-Baroque expressiveness and Rottmayr's focus on the humanisation of the depiction, which is actually noticeable. The lack of expression and the expressed naturalisation are caused by the uniform iconographic template of the *Throne of Mercy*, a triumphant scene celebrating the highest point of Christianity (death for the forgiveness of sins and resurrection), as well as celebrating its basic truth – the Holy Trinity.

Petar II Antun Hillebrand von Prandau has been immortalised in several portraits, which have been ordered from the portrait painter Ephraim Hochhauser. Petar II Antun ordered two groups of portraits from that formally educated artist from Vienna, whose origins are in today's Slovakia.¹⁴ The first group consist of four portraits from the former family residence in Styria, castle Authal,¹⁵ and they display Petar II Antun, his two daughters Marija Franziska and Marija Josefa, and

⁸ Švajcer, O. Portretno slikarstvo u Osijeku u 19. stoljeću. Peristil 22(1979), Zagreb: Društvo povjesničara umjetnosti SR Hrvatske, p. 143.

⁹ Vladimir Bečić, for example, painted Rudolf Normann in the castle. Cf. Švajcer, O. Likovna kronika Osijeka 1850 – 1969. Osijek: Galerija likovnih umjetnosti, 1991, p. 174.

¹⁰ See text in this catalogue: Najcer Sabljak, J.; Lužević, S. History of the Fine Arts Collection of the Valpovo Landowners.

¹¹ More in: Perčić, Lj. Valpovačko vlastelinstvo na početku uprave baruna P. A. Hillebranda. Anali Zavoda za znanstveni i umjetnički rad u Osijeku 24(2008), Osijek: HAZU, Zavod za znanstveni i umjetnički rad, p. 75–96.

¹² Ibid., p. 80–81.

¹³ Cf. Švajcer, O. Johann Michael Rottmayr : Sveto Trojstvo. Vjesti muzealaca i konzervatora Hrvatske, 23, 3–4 (1974), Zagreb, p. 49–54. For the addition to the analysis if it is the work of a workshop, after Švajcer's correspondence with the Rottmayr specialists see: Švajcer, O. Domaći i strani slikari XVIII. i XIX. stoljeća u Galeriji likovnih umjetnosti Osijek. Osijek: Galerija likovnih umjetnosti, 1988, p. 11–17.

¹⁴ More on the life of Ephraim Hochhauser: Thoma, Ulrich; Becker, Felix; Allgemeines Lexikon der Bildenden Künstler, XVII, Leipzig: E. A. Seemann, 1999 [1924]; Švajcer, O. O nekim slikarima baroka, rokoka i klasicima i njihovim djelinu u Galeriji likovnih umjetnosti u Osijeku. In: Galerija likovnih umjetnosti Osijek. Goll, P. (ed.). Osijek: Galerija likovnih umjetnosti, 1987, p. 35–46; Švajcer, O. Portreti Ephraima Hochhausera u Galeriji likovnih umjetnosti u Osijeku. Vjesti muzealaca i konzervatora Hrvatske 21, 1(1972), Zagreb, p. 8–16. The first comprehensive study on Hochhauser was published in 2017: Schirlbauer, A. Ephraim Hochhauser – ein kaum bekannter Malerkollege von Troger, Maulbertsch und Meytens. Unpublished manuscript, 2017. URL: <https://www.anna-schirlbauer.com/publikationen/>

¹⁵ The castle and property Authal in the Styrian small town of Zellweg was bought by Baron Petar Antun in 1738 and given to his daughter, Baroness Marija Josefa von Pfeffershofen (1711 – 1758), and his son-in-law, Baron Johann Wilhelm von Pfeffershofen (1681 – ?), to live in, and it remained the property of the Prandau family until 1783. The property provided very high income from fishing thanks to its position on the Mura river. Göth, G. Das Herzogthum Steiermark, vol. 3. Graz: Judenberg Preis, 1843, p. 342–343; Frimmel, T. Notizen über Werke von österreichischen Künstlern. Mittheilungen der K. K. Central-Comission, XXII (1896), Vienna: K. K. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, p. 92–121.

For additional information on Authal and for loaning me the works for the exhibition, I would like to thank the current owner of the castle Authal, Ms Antonette Croy.

¹ Danhelovsky, Adolf. Die Excellenz Gustav Hillebrand Freiherr von Prandau'schen Domänen Valpo und Dolnji-Miholjac in Slavonien. Vienna: K. K. Hofbuchhandlung Wilhelm Frick, 1885.

² Kuhač, F. K. Valpovo i njegovi gospodari. Zagreb: Dionička tiskara, 1876.

³ Karaman, I. Valpovačko vlastelinstvo : ekonomsko-historijska analiza. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1962.

⁴ Švajcer's analysis and studies of specific works from the private collection of the families Prandau and Normann are contained in the comprehensive reviews of the art pieces of the Gallery (Museum) of Fine Arts. In order to avoid congesting the text in the footnotes, see the list of references under Švajcer.

⁵ Najcer Sabljak, J. Umjetničke zbirke vlastelinskih obitelji u Slavoniji i Srijemu. Doktorski rad. Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet, 2012.

⁶ Vinaj, M. Knjižna zbirka Prandau-Normann kao muzološki fenomen. Doktorski rad. Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet, 2012.

⁷ For the purpose of preserving all culturally important objects, the Committee for the Collection and Preservation of Cultural and Historical Monuments and Antiquities (KOMZA) was founded in 1945 with the Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of Croatia, which was in charge of nationalisation after the end of World War II. More in: Matković, A. Konzervatorski sustav u Hrvatskoj, 1945 – 1960 : osobite, zakonodavstvo, praksa. Diplomski rad. Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet, 2015.

the latter's husband, Johann Wilhelm Baron von Pfeffershofen (cat. no. 16–19, MLU). The portraits are uniform, which is especially visible on the portraits of Marija Franziska and Marija Josefa. Sisters, with almost identical portrait characteristics and wearing very similar dresses, are painted in an exterior space in somewhat sappy poses – Marija Franziska with a floral wreath and Marija Josefa holding a basket with fruit. Somewhat more personality of the portrayed individuals was expressed in the male portraits from this group. Baron Pfeffershofen is shown in a knightly armour with a helmet placed beside him on which he rests his hand, his expression is very serious and his eyes are dark and piercing. A dignified posture and sternness are reinforcing the military character of the portrayed individual.¹⁶ There is also a portrait of Petar II Antun in a seating position with a snuff box in his hand, shown in a somewhat milder manner, as a well-intentioned, kindly old man, but in a dignified position. The background, through an open window, shows glimpses of an unknown building. Similar to that portrait, there is a depiction of a now somewhat older, Petar II Antun at the Valpovo portrait (cat. no. 14, MLU), in another group of Hochhauser's artwork ordered by the Prandaus. The portrait of his second wife, Marija Kristina nee Lattermann (cat. no. 15, MLU), and the assumed portrait of the first wife of Petar's son, Marija Viktorija nee Jabornigg zu Gamsenegg (cat. no. 20, MLU), which raises doubts related to the author and the identity of the portrayed person, belong to the same group. Švajcer is basing his observations on the assumption that the portrayed person is actually Marija Viktorija and he considers that the portrait was created in the painter's advanced age, even though he points out the unusual retardation of style when compared to the earlier portraits.¹⁷ The differences in the formation are actually there – most of all, the colour quality and the principles of lighting are different from the portraits definitely made by Hochhauser. Apart from that, Hochhauser has a very acute sense of the tactile nature of the material, he focuses more on the shape, and in the portrait of Marija Viktorija the tendency toward painting form is dominant. On the basis of the style characteristics, Jasminka Najcer Sabljak considers the painting to be the work of an unknown painter from the circle of Martin van Meytens Jr., i.e. she questions whether Hochhauser is the author and identifies the person as an unknown noblewoman from the Prandau family.¹⁸ This research has not provided additional answers, so the author and the identity of the portrayed person is still kept at the level of an assumption. The only signed portrait from both groups is a representative portrait of Petar II Antun from 1750 (cat. no. 13, MLU), and there was an error made during one of the restorations.¹⁹ The Baron is shown in full size and in representative form, dignified and elegant. His role as the man who reconstructed the Valpovo Estate, particularly the castle, which is in the background of the portrait, with very expressive clouds above it, is emphasized. Apart from the distinguished and affirmative nature of the

portrait, his role is additionally emphasized in the base of the portrait, where the Baron is addressed as *VALPO RESTAURATOR*. The portrait was created, except for the purpose of representing the status and power of the nobleman, as a product of the confirmation of the right to inheritance for female descendants as well,²⁰ and the reconstruction of the castle was also completed during those years.²¹

The following group of portraits is the one of Petar's son and successor, Baron Josip Ignjat Žigmund Hillebrand von Prandau and his third wife, Marija Ana Eleonora nee Pejačević Virovićka. Out of five portraits (three of Josip Ignjat and two of Marija Ana), only one has been signed, the one of Marija Ana in full size, and the remaining portraits are traditionally attributed to the same author, Johann Anton Zitterer.²² While the situation with the authorship of Hochhauser is somewhat clearer, it is a little bit more complex with these five portraits, because they have been used as models for each other, and one must be very careful when attributing them to anyone, because input from as many as three authors can be recognised on them.

The representative portrait of Marija Ana from 1809 (cat. no. 28, MLU) (the only signed work by Zitterer) shows the young Baroness in interior space, wearing a simple white dress and covered with a red robe. She is leaning against a secretary cabinet with a bust of Josip Ignjat, shown as a Roman patrician. The portrait was painted in the style of French neo-Classicism, with light brushstrokes, clean lines, diffuse lighting, with just hints of shadows and mild light transitions, and very accurate regarding anatomy and space. For the bust, painted in golden-yellow tones, the artist used the first portrait from this group in chronological order, the one of Josip Ignjat above the waist, formed into an oval, which was created around 1800 (cat. no. 24, MLU). The Baron is shown with a serious expression on an oval face, with highly positioned eyebrows, swollen eyelids and bags under his eyes, with pointed, irregular nose, and narrow but full lips. Due to the descriptive similarities between the bust and this portrait, it is clear that it was used as a model, but they are different in several details regarding style and execution: The Baron's bust has a rounded face, round facial features, in opposition to the pointed ones on the portrait, and the differences are also noticeable in the details of the hair and moustache.

The portrait of the Baron in full size (cat. no. 27, MLU), a pair to the previously mentioned portrait of Marija Ana, was also attributed to Zitterer. The representative portrait of the Baron serves the same purpose as the portrait of his father, it is used by the Baron to display his influence and power, celebrate his position as the landowner of Valpovo, and take pride in some achievements in construction, which are helpful for determining the time when the painting was made.²³ However, even at

first glance there are significant differences between the portraits of the Baron and the Baroness. The Baron was painted very flatly, almost collage, the positioning of the figure and the objects that frame him into the space is very clumsy, and the detail with the view of the veduta of Valpovo in the background makes the entire impression of perspective illogical. The portrait characteristics of the Baron at this portrait, when compared to the mentioned portrait and bust, are also different: The Baron's face here is round, with almond eyes, regular, straight nose and wider lips. The painter is forming the tones of the skin colour by adding green and brown hues on the portrait of the entire figure, and the base that is partially visible on the edges of the Baron's figure is also different – in this portrait it is in a beige hue, and on the oval portrait the base is partially visible in a bluish hue. The uniform that the Baron is wearing has been painted in monochrome, without an indication of volume, but intertwined with many attentively painted embroidered details. The Baron's right hand, which looks as if it is painfully cramped, is leaning on the table, which has been shortened in perspective, and the objects on it are placed frontally. As a side note, the objects on the secretary cabinet on the portrait of Marija Ana are shortened in perspective and placed to blend in with the space. In the background, the Baron is also followed by the detail of his wife's bust, also shown as a Roman patrician, but her bust is in grey tones. The portrait characteristics of the bust and the portrait of the Baroness are again different in the details of the eyes, nose, and lips. In the portrait, her face is more oval and bloated, generally different from the face on the bust. Also, the difference is noticeable in the manuscript of the artist itself, if we describe the signature on the portrait of Marija Ana and the text²⁴ written on the note placed on the table next to the portrait of the Baron.

The remaining two, smaller, oval portraits of the married couple (cat. no. 25, 26, MLU) are stylistically similar to the Baron's full size portrait. They are dated to the same year, the portrait characteristics of the Baron are identical to those on the large portrait, and they are different than those in his earliest portrait. We should add their clothes to those differences, which is, unlike the voluminous clothes on the first portrait, painted flat and within strict lines, similar to the large portrait. When we compare the Baroness's oval portrait, we can notice the resemblance with the bust on her husband's portrait and the differences from her (signed) full size portrait. The portrait characteristics are identical to those on the bust (aside from the age difference); rounded face, almond eyes, proportioned nose, and dark hair are in opposition to the oval face with rounded eyes and the irregular nose on the signed portrait, and the Baroness's hair, tied in a bun, is of a lighter shade than on the oval portrait of the Baroness. The clothes make it clear that the signed portrait was used as a model for the oval portrait, but here, opposite to the strict Classicist impostation on the signed portrait, the personality of the Baroness has been emphasized

with a mild smile and moved arms. The anatomical errors are present, same as on the Baron's full size portrait, the Baroness's shoulder appears to be dislocated. There are also differences in the formation of the Baroness's breasts, which are compact and ample in the signed portrait and placed apart and round on the oval portrait and the bust. *Summa summarum*, if we compare the Valpovo portraits with other famous works by Zitterer,²⁵ but also on the basis of the Valpovo portraits themselves (one signed and four unsigned), we can see that there is need for reattribution and a new stylistic interpretation of the "Zitterer's" portraits from Valpovo. The presented comparison of style and portrait characteristics indicates three different artists: The oval portrait of Josip Ignjat by an unknown artist, dated to around 1800, then the portrait of Marija Ana by Johann Anton Zitterer, signed and dated to 1809, used in the Baron's portrait as a model for the bust, and three portraits (two of Josip Ignjat and one of Marija Ana) by the third, also unknown, artist, of which the Baroness's portrait is modelled after the Zitterer's full size portrait of Marija Ana. The last three, dated according to the Ziterer's portrait, are made at the same time or a little bit after it.

Through the patronage activities of Anton Gustav Hillebrand von Prandau and his wife Adela nee Cseh de Szent Kátolna, the spirit of Romanticism and Biedermeier was brought into the private family collection. Along with the portraits of the married couple, which were created according to photographs (cat. no. 34, 35, MLU),²⁶ the two portraits of the Baroness's brothers, Viktor and Antun, became part of the collection (cat. no. 32, 33, MLU), which was brought to the collection by Adela after she got married.²⁷ A very significant order of family portraits happened in the middle of the 19th century, when Gustav, in a short period, ordered as much as four portraits of this three daughters, from a reputable Viennese portrait painter Friedrich Amerling.²⁸ These are the two portraits of Marijana widow Zichy married Normann-Ehrenfels, one of Alvinna married Pejačević, and one of Stephanie married Majláth. Two portraits, of Alvinna and one of Marijana (cat. no. 39, 40, MLU), are a part of the holdings of the Museum of Fine Arts. The other portrait of Marijana was inherited by her daughter Ana Adela and brought to Spišský Hrhov, from where it was transferred to the Spišské museum in Levoča, which was described in the writings of Sabine Grabner, and conveyed by Jasminka Najcer Sabljak.²⁹ The portrait of Stephanie was transferred by her descendants from Miholjac to Budapest, where it is still located, in private ownership.³⁰ Amerling was keeping diligent records about almost all the paintings he painted, so the portraits of Stephanie and one of Marijana are entered under 1851, and the one of Alvinna is entered under 1852.³¹ It was believed that the portrait of Marijana in Levoča was a copy of the Valpovo portrait,³² which was proven false in 2010, after a detailed stylistic analysis and professional treatment, and the portrait from Levoča was

16 More on the career of Baron Pfeffershofen: Schmutz, C. Historisch-topographisches Lexicon von Steyermark, vol. 3. Graz : Andreas Kienreich, 1822, p. 143; Schirbauer, A. mentioned work, 2017, p. 35–36.

17 Švajcer, O. mentioned work, 1972, p. 14–15.

18 Najcer Sabljak, J. mentioned work, 2012, p. 54–55, 14.

19 The artist is signed as E. Hochhuser, an error that occurred during restoration due to the lack of knowledge of the restorer or the member of the family who ordered the restoration. Cf. Švajcer, O. mentioned work, 1987, p. 37. We should also add that the group of portraits from Authal is unsigned. There are short inscriptions on the backs of the portraits about the identity of the portrayed individuals, the author, and the year when it was made (1740). They have definitely been written somewhat later, by the successors of Baron von Pfeffershofen and Marija Josefa or by the later inhabitants of the castle Authal, which is also evident from the fact that the back of the portraits of Marija Josefa also contains the year of her death (1758).

20 Švajcer, O. mentioned work, 1972, p. 12–13.

21 Najcer Sabljak, J. mentioned work, 2012, p. 54.

22 Cf. Švajcer, O., Klasičistički i bidernajerski portreti u Galeriji likovnih umjetnosti u Osijeku. Zvot umjetnosti 28(1979), Zagreb, p. 58–60; Švajcer, O. mentioned work, 1987, p. 40; Švajcer, O. mentioned work, 1987/88, p. 150–153; Najcer Sabljak, J. mentioned work, 2012, p. 56–58.

23 The background of the portrait shows Valpovo on the north side, with a view of the medieval tower with two buildings in its base, one of them is the Valpovo theatre building with the parade stables in the centre, and the grain silo on Zeleni brnjeg is at the bottom of the veduta. Najcer Sabljak, J. mentioned work, 2012, p. 57. For more details on the Valpovo theatre see: Perić, Lj. Komitetji-Haus zu Valbo. Prilog poznavanju kazališnog života u Valpovu od 1809.

do 1823. godine u svjetlu arhivskog fonda obitelji Prandau i Normann. Osječki zbornik 28(2007), Osijek, p. 127–142; Perić, Lj. Graditelj kazališta na majuru Antun (Anton) Hartmann (1749. – 1830.). Anali Zavoda za znanstveni i umjetnički rad u Osijeku 31(2015), Osijek. The theatre was founded in 1809, at the same time when Zitterer's portrait of Marija Ana, which is also the generally accepted dating of the portrait of Josip Ignjat.

24 *Illustrissimo Domino Josepho / Hillebrand L. B. a Prandau S. C. / et R. A. M. Consilario, Icti Cettu / Verocensis Tabulae Juridicae Primarii / Assessori, Icti Dni Valpo Haereditario Domino / Terrestri, Dno gratioso colendissimo Valpovo.*

25 Of the lesser known Zitterer's works, the author had access to the portraits of Joseph Haydn and Emperor Joseph II Habsburg, and the altarpiece from the side-altar from the Elizabethan church of St Francis of Assisi in Linz.

26 Najcer Sabljak, J. mentioned work, 2012, p. 61, 299.

27 *Ibid.*, p. 58. Common practice of dowry, but also the natural need to preserve the memory of one's loved ones.

28 Balen, B. Dva portreta Friedricha Amerlinga u Galeriji likovnih umjetnosti u Osijeku. Godišnjak Njemačke narodnosne zajednice (2005), Osijek, p. 77. Švajcer wrote about the three portraits before, but at that time he did not know about the fourth portrait (second of Marijana), which is not mentioned in his sources. Cf. Švajcer, O. Dva portreta Alvine Pejačević u Galeriji likovnih umjetnosti u Osijeku. Peristiti 14–15, 1 (1972), Zagreb, p. 209–212.

29 Najcer Sabljak, J. mentioned work, 2012, p. 59.

30 *Ibid.*

31 Frankl, L. A. Friedrich von Amerling - Ein Lebensbild. Vienna, Pest, Leipzig : A. Hartleben's Verlag, 1889, p. 176.

32 Balen, B. mentioned work, 2005, p. 77.

dated before 1850.³³ In both portraits, Marijana is shown in the three-quarter profile view, with a mildly downturned head and tied hair with camellias in it. The differences on the portraits include the background, which is lighter on the one in Levoča, as well as the clothes. In the portrait from Valpovo, the Countess is wearing black and the background is darker, which is why the portrait is exuding melancholy and sadness in general. The portrait from Levoča is considered to be a piece created just before Marijana got married to her first husband, Count Zichy, and the one from Valpovo was created after he died, during her mourning period, which is why the more *cheerful* portrait from Levoča was considered inappropriate.³⁴ The assumption is that Gustav, after he ordered the portrait of Stephanie from Amerling, just before she was to be married in 1851, also ordered another portrait of Marijana, who, instead of posing, offered the first portrait as a model.³⁵

The portrait of Alvina is considered to be *the most valuable portrait painting in Slavonia in the 19th century*.³⁶ Friedrich Amerling was known as an excellent portrait artist, who could achieve an impressive level of likeness between the physical and painted portrait characteristics,³⁷ which is the case with the portrait of Alvina, if we compare the portrait characteristics of the other known portraits of her.³⁸ However, this portrait, along with the masterfully painted portrait characteristics, stands out because of the strong psychological note of the young Countess and the painting poetics. Her femininity, the porcelain-like shine of her face, her sensuality and the piercing, somewhat seductive look, invite the observer to pause on that look and see the entire figure of the Countess, through her smiling lips and deep cleavage. The painter conveyed the fullness of the beauty of the female form on canvas with great dedication, making the sensuality appear real, almost tangible. Alvina and her husband, Count Pavao Pejačević, built a residence in Podgorač, which was, among other things, furnished with about sixty pieces of art (cat. no. 49–64, MLU), which the married couple collected in only about thirty years.³⁹ The importance of furnishing the living space with high-quality art (in a very short period!) is evidence in favour of a very developed artistic sensibility and collecting practices of Alvina and Pavle, which was doubtlessly impressed upon them through education, since both spouses originated from families of avid collectors with attuned collecting tastes.⁴⁰ Considering that Alvina and Pavao did not have children, Pavao sold the property to Alvina's nephew, Rudolf Joseph (Rudolf I) von Normann-Ehrenfels, with the right of use for

The portrait of Alvina, painted by Friedrich Amerling, 1851.

[[] 33 Hradilovi, J.; Milerová, H. Painting Technique of Portraits painted in the 19th century by Friedrich von Amerling. *Acta Artis Academica* (2010), Prag, p. 160–162.

[[] 34 Ibid., p. 162.

[[] 35 Najcer Sabljak, J. mentioned work, 2012, p. 60.

[[] 36 Ibid., p. 60. Much was written about the portrait and it is an unavoidable part of all 19th century art overviews in Slavonia: Švajcer, O. mentioned work, 1972, p. 209–212; Vodič stalnog postava Galerije likovnih umjetnosti u Osijeku. Gol, P. (ed.). *Osijek: Galerija likovnih umjetnosti, 1978*, p. 45–46; Švajcer, O. mentioned work, 1988, p. 95, 154–156; Ti stoljeća umjetnosti. Vjekoslav Bižak (ed.). *Osijek: Galerija likovnih umjetnosti, 1998*, p. 12, 74; Balen, B. mentioned work, 2005, p. 75–78; Maković, Ž. *Slikarstvo 19. stoljeća. Slavonija, Baranja i Srijem – vrela europske civilizacije*. Sv. 2. Biškupić, B. (ed.). Zagreb : Ministarstvo kulture Republike Hrvatske : Galerija Klovičevi dveri, 2009, p. 473; Hradilovi, J.; Milerová, H. mentioned work, 2010, p. 137–164; Kraševac, I. *Likovne umjetnosti i umjetnički obrt u 19. stoljeću. In: Hrvatska umjetnost : povijest i spomenici*. Zagreb : Institut za povijest umjetnosti : Školska knjiga, 2010, p. 489; Najcer Sabljak, J. mentioned work, 2012, p. 59–61, 22.

[[] 37 Švajcer, O. mentioned work, 1972, p. 211.

[[] 38 Alvina was portrayed by the painter Karl Rahl in 1856 and the sculptor József Engel in 1868. More: Švajcer, O. mentioned work, 1972, p. 209–212; Najcer Sabljak, J. *Skirveno blago podgoračkog dvorca. Osječki zbornik 30(2011)*, Osijek, p. 161–179; Najcer Sabljak, J. mentioned work, 2012, p. 136–137, 156, 143, 158; Najcer Sabljak, J.; Lučević, S. *Likovna baština obitelji Pejačević. Osijek: Galerija likovnih umjetnosti, 2013*, p. 47, 50–51, 144–145, 242–243.

[[] 39 Najcer Sabljak, J. mentioned work, 2011, p. 178.

[[] 40 Jasminka Najcer Sabljak summarised the significance of Alvina in the following manner: *With her collecting qualities and personal engagement in fine arts in the process of creating the Podgorač Collection, she is unique in the observed collections of Slavonian noble families*. Najcer Sabljak, J. mentioned work, p. 131.

[[] 41 Najcer Sabljak, J. mentioned work, 2011, p. 162.

[[] 42 When KOMZA arrived to the castle, some of the art was found in the attic. See: Ostavtšina Ota Švajcera, MLU-M-1, Popis predmeta s tavana valpovačkog dvorca.

[[] 43 Front side: D[IS]. M[ANIBUS]. S[ACRUM]. / COLOMANNI HILLEBRAND / LIBERI BARONIS A PRANDAU / OUOD MORTALE FUIT / HAC URNA CONDITUM JACET. / OUID ATRA EXULTAS ATROPOS / S[IL]IA CONVALLIUM MARCESCUNT? / S[IL]I TANTAE PARENTUM DELICIAE / TANTA FUTURÆ PROPAGINIS SPES / TANTÆ DYNASTIÆ HERES / FATO PRÆCOQ[UI] OCCUMBIT? / TENERUÆ COR MATRIS / ATROCITATE DOLORIS RUMPITUR? / NONNE UT EXEMPO REVELLES / SUB SOLE NIL STABILE / CUNCTA CADUCA ESSE. Left side: ADELHAI[S] / NATA CSEH DE SZ KATOLINA / CONSORS L BARONIS / GUSTAVI HILLEBRAND A PRANDAU / MÆRENIS ERERTV MATER / TETRO AGITATA JACTURÆ DOLORE / MUNDO EXEMPLI / MATRIBUS SPECULI LOCI / MÆSTUM MATERNI DOLORIS / EXEMPLAR / T. H. M. P. Right side: AVE TENELLA / DULCIS FILOLI ANIMA / QUEM POPULO TANTUM MONSTARUNT / ADVERSA FATA / ASTRUM LUCI EDITUM / XI KALENDAS OCTOBRES / MDCCCXXI / REPENTEQUE SUBTRACTUM / IX KALENDAS MARTIAS / MDCCCXXXV // IN JÆTERNUM SALVE!

[[] 44 More on the bust of Matija Petar Katančić in: Koch-Kuhač, F. Ž. Mentioned work, 1876, p. 18, 26; Najman, S.; Stanić, D. 125 godina od postavljanja spomenika Matiji Petru Katančiću. *Valpovački godišnjak* (1998), Valpovo : Ogranak Matice hrvatske, p. 28–30.

life.⁴¹ After Pavao died, the art was transferred to the Valpovo castle, where some paintings were stored in the attic and some distributed across the rooms in the castle.⁴²

Apart from their three daughters, Gustav and Adela had a son named Koloman, who died when he was five. To commemorate his death, a monument (cat. no. 38, MLU) was placed in the Valpovo parish church around 1836. This burial monument is one of the rare sculptures collected by the family patronage activities. The sculpture on the monument is showing an upright child with its eyes directed upward. It is being held up by a kneeling angel looking in the same direction. An unknown sculptor made the sculpture in the spirit of neo-Classicism regarding its formation, in sculpting terms it is very clear and its form is clean. The kneeling angelic figure appears very mature and composed, with a serious expression on its face, lips lightly parted, with its left hand on its bent knee and its right hand holding up the figure of the child. The child is standing on its toes and a small piece of drapery is covering its genitals. The figure of the child psychologically contains the innocence of a child, there is no pathos or sadness inherent in the death of the only male heir, instead it emphasizes the playful nature of a child. If we add the fact that the child's gender is not emphasized, even though it is known that that a male child is buried here, the artist's intention to psychologically represent a child in the manner it has been shown is clear – as a playful uncorrupted child. The interesting group of sculpted figures is the same regarding their style and shape, but distinct in character. On the one hand, a calm and somewhat cold angel is the typical example of neo-Classicism, and on the other hand, the sculptor is bringing in a spirit of Romanticism with a thorough psychological analysis of the child. Today, the sculpture is located in the south-west corner of the Valpovo parish church, on the epistle side. A pedestal elevated in the shape of a trapezoid, coated with marble, contains three inscription fields with prayer invocations and written information about the deceased and the people who ordered the sculpture.⁴³

As a memorial to the resident of Valpovo Matija Petar Katančić, Gustav commissioned a bust, which is placed in the park opposite to the entrance into the Valpovo castle today.⁴⁴ According to the writings of Adolf Danhelovski, several sculptures were used as decorations for the park at the Miholjac castle: at the main façade of the pavilion there was a veranda and the sculptures of Flora and Pomona, and around the park there were other sculptures and as

many as four fountains, also furnished with sculptures.⁴⁵ The author does not mention additional information that can be used to describe or date the sculptures, but he is definitely warning us about a valuable monument of park architecture which has been lost to us today.

Another work by a domestic artist is attributed to the acquisitions of Gustav Prandau, which was the first time that a work by a domestic master, an already established and well-known painter, teacher at the *Osijek Painting School*, Hugo Conrad von Hötendorf (cat. no. 65, MLU)⁴⁶ entered the collection. The work was made in 1856,⁴⁷ it shows a representative Romantistic landscape of the Slavonian forest of pronounced expression. There is a rotten downed tree at the front in the centre of the composition, with a thick lush forest behind it. Tree trunks that have been cut down are stacked next to the tree and there is an unproportioned, very small figure of a shepherd (male of female) with goats and a dog. The strong expression is forming the heroism of this landscape, partly dictated by the artist's hand, partly by the appearance of the scene itself. The canvas is equipped with finely carved and richly profiled wood frame that adds some expression to the painting. According to a KOMZA document, when the Committee arrived in 1945, Hötendorf's canvas was located at the attic of the Valpovo castle and was entered into the final lists of nationalised art pieces, after an intervention from an unsigned collector.⁴⁸

After Marijana married Count Heinrich Friedrich Konstantin von Normann-Ehrenfels, the Valpovo Estate got new masters. But the patronage and collection activities at the estate have not disappeared with the Prandau family. On the contrary, the von Normann-Ehrenfels family kept the patronage activities at a high level, and another significant fact is that when they arrived, along with the previously mentioned Hötendorf, art made by mostly domestic artists entered into the collection. In the 1860s, Josip Franjo Mücke made a series of six family portraits (one portrait of Konstantin and five portraits of children) (cat. no. 41–46, MLU). A portrait that stands out among those is that of the three-year-old *Alvina von Normann-Ehrenfels with a Dog*, which is usually described as one of the highest quality works by Mücke. The girl is shown as a serious young countess of noble style, accompanied by a dog around which she wrapped her arms, and the dog's head in on the child's lap. The artist has skilfully formed the volume and paid special attention to the details and the portrait. Errors regarding anatomy, which are also present in this portrait, are a common problem for Mücke,⁴⁹ while he is very skilled in

[[] 45 Danhelovsky, A. mentioned work, 1885, p. 324–325.

[[] 46 Cf. Najcer Sabljak, J. mentioned work, 2012, p. 62.

[[] 47 Najcer Sabljak, on the basis of KOMZA records, suggested new dating and clarified the situation related to this piece. The inventory book of the Museum of Fine Arts lists Hötendorf's canvas as an acquisition from 1964 and the KOMZA records from Valpovo list one Hötendorf's piece with the same dimensions, same signature and the same motif of the Slavonian forest. Considering that neither the Museum of Slavonia nor the Museum of Fine Arts keep any other canvases by the artist that would match the KOMZA records, the circumstances around which the work (already registered in the KOMZA records, therefore nationalised) found its way to the carpenter who then sold it to the Gallery of Fine Arts at the time are still unclear. More in : Najcer Sabljak, J. mentioned work, 2012, p. 62; Najcer Sabljak, J. Šuma u slikarstvu Slavonije. In: Šuma : slikarstvo, kiparstvo, književnost, produkt dizajn in ciklusa priroda (Šuma, vode, zemlja, more). Poblečki Stotić, J. (ed.). Zagreb : Umjetnički paviljon u Zagrebu : Hrvatski drveni klaster, 2017., p. 48.

[[] 48 Ostavtšina Ota Švajcera, MLU-M-1, Popis predmeta s tavana valpovačkog dvorca.

[[] 49 Iso Krinjavi and Josip Juraj Strossmayer have not considered Mücke to be a talented painter and they did not have a good opinion about him. Cf. Schneider, M. *Historijski muzej Hrvatske, 1969*, p. 25; Kraševac, I. *Knjiga prvca. Šišić, F. (ed.)*. Zagreb : Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1928., p. 41.

[[] 50 See the text in this catalogue: Najcer Sabljak, J.; Lučević, S. *History of the Fine Arts Collection of the Valpovo Landowners*.

[[] 51 Bačić, R. *Likovna umjetnost u Osijeku. In: Jubilarni almanah Kluba hrvatskih književnika i umjetnika u Osijeku, Osijek: Klub hrvatskih književnika i umjetnika, 1929*, p. 128; Najcer Sabljak, J. mentioned work, 2012, p. 66–67. A detailed list with the sales prices achieved is located in the fonds of the Croatian State Archives. HR-HDA-1979. Hrvatsko društvo likovnih umjetnika 1879 – 1992., kutija 12, Izložba u Osijeku 1906 – 1907. I would like to thank Irena Kraševac for her help.

[[] 52 Bačić's article also mentions one piece by Ivan Tišov bought by Count Rudolf at this exhibition, which could not be found. On the other hand, the lists with prices do not contain Tišov's work at all.

[[] 53 Najcer Sabljak, J. mentioned work, 2012, p. 67; Magaš, L. s.v. 1698. *Dragan Melus. Slavonija, Baranja i Srijem – vrela europske civilizacije : exhibition catalogue*. Biškupić, B. (ed.). Zagreb : Ministarstvo kulture Republike Hrvatske : Galerija Klovičevi dveri, 2009., p. 465.

[[] 54 After KOMZA arrived in the Valpovo castle, Čiko's painting was found in the tailoring room. Cf. Ostavtšina Ota Švajcera, MLU-M-1, Popis predmeta s tavana valpovačkog dvorca.

[[] 55 About the legend see in: Koch-Kuhač, F. Ž. mentioned work, 1876, p. 6.

[[] 56 Najcer Sabljak, J. mentioned work, 2012, p. 65. Švajcer mentioned Bužan's portrait of Julijana. Švajcer, O. mentioned work, 1991, p. 66.

landscapes.

Patronage and sponsoring activities of the family were kept at the high level until the end of the First World War. The last art orders and acquisitions, which are also very significant in the context of national art history, are attributed to Rudolf and Julijana Normann-Ehrenfels nee Edle von Vest. They are individuals of local, but also of national significance, not only because of the valuable acquisitions, but also in general. Julijana is particularly significant in the context of preserving the family collection, and the married couple also participated in the enrichment of collections of some museum institutions.⁵⁰ At the Art Society exhibition in 1906, the married couple bought paintings by Bela Čikoš Sesija, Mencijs Klement Crnčić, Mato Celestin Medović (cat. no. 77–79, MLU) and Ivan Tišov,⁵¹ a and several years later, a piece by Dragan Melkus became a part of the collection (cat. no. 80, MLU).⁵² Čikoš's painting *Trenč's Pandurs*⁵³ shows two pandurs at dusk; dusk lighting and the mystified atmosphere that darken the scene evoke the artist's symbolist preferences. Understanding of the painting and the focus of the characters, as well as the observers, has been moved outside of the frame of the canvas with the pandurs' gaze and the hand gesture toward an unknown direction. Apart from its quality, the painting also attracted the married couple with its motif and the title, considering the unfounded legend connecting Baron Trenck and Valpovo.⁵⁴

Apart from these significant acquisitions, two Croatian artists also painted portraits of the members of the family. Along with the preserved portraits of Count Rudolf and his daughter Vera by the painter Joso Bužan (cat. no. 68, 69, MLU), it is assumed that the artist also made portraits of other members of the family.⁵⁵ Bužan painted a portrait of Rudolf in the form of a representative portrait, in which the Count is shown in a dignified pose, as a politically powerful nobleman. In the standing position, the Count is resting his left hand on a sword, he is wearing magnate jewellery and the expression on his face is serious, slightly stern. The interior space in which he was painted contains several decorative motifs, the decorative nature of which was carefully dosed by darkening the background and putting the portrait in focus. The decorative nature is somewhat more expressed in the portrait of the young countess Vera, but it is not all-encompassing. Quick and short brushstrokes make the painting very expressive regarding its tone and colour, and the focus of the light on the portraits is additionally emphasized with a dark red background. The elements of the Colourful Zagreb School are clearly visible in this portrait, and the portraits of

[[] 56 Najcer Sabljak, J. mentioned work, 2012, p. 65.

the Normann family are very significant in the opus of the artist. The following portrait of Count Rudolf was painted by Vladimir Bečić (cat. no. 66, MLU) inside the castle.⁵⁶ The Count was painted in a luxurious armchair, in an intimate atmosphere, he is wearing his magnate jewellery and his sharp gaze gives of an air of a charismatic individual. Same as the portrait by Bužan, this portrait has also been painted according to the Modern understanding of the presentation of the figure. Bečić is forming the volume with formative application of paint, without smoothing out the stroke and by mixing the colours on the canvas. His strokes are more restrained when painting jewellery, which is done very meticulously, same with some parts of the armchair. Regarding the composition, the Count is placed in the centre of the painting, and the spatial relations in which the armchair dictates the placement, which is why Count's legs are crudely shortened, reveal that it is the work of a young and inexperienced artist. Rudolf and Julijana Normann are unique individuals in the context of Croatian national fine arts heritage, due to their recognition of the quality of recently established Croatian Modern painters and their preference for Croatian artists ahead of foreign names which were also available to them, and their engagement related to the local heritage.

Religious Art

Apart from the already mentioned *Throne of Mercy* by Johann Franz Rottmayr, commissioned for the castle chapel, the families Prandau and Normann were ordering art pieces for religious structures all over the estate. This was one of their obligations as patrons of all the parishes on the estate, but they would also often order artwork due to their personal devotion and vows. The patronage activities of the family in the area of religious art were surely more significant than what is shown here, which will be determined by future research on the materials located outside of the heritage institutions. Unfortunately, there are very few archival records on this matter, but concerning the quality and number of artistic accomplishments in the churches of the former Valpovo Estate,⁵⁷ a large number of those can doubtlessly be connected to noble families.

One of the altar paintings related to the family patronage activities, entered into Canonical Visitations as the order by Baron Karl Hilleprand von Prandau, is the *Apotheosis of Charles Borromeo* (cat. no. 8, MLU) from the small chapel in Lacići dedicated to that saint and also the only preserved and confirmed acquisition by that baron.⁵⁸ The painting is depicting deification separated into two sections. In the lower part there are two painted groups of the diseased over which the saint is kneeling

on a cloud, accompanied by angels, with his eyes pointed toward God the Father and the Mother of God with the Child. The upper part of the composition is oriented toward the depiction of the saint on the left. In front of him, as the compositional connection between the lower (worldly) and upper (divine) register, there is the floating Archangel Uriel. A very impressive lower register, from the painting point of view, consists of two groups of figures. On the right, the group of sick individuals formed into a shape of a pyramid⁵⁹ is finished at the top with a figure of a young man carrying an old man, and the diagonal line created by him crosses over to Uriel over him and also creates the main compositional axis. An interesting detail of a mother on the far right is a part of that group, whose monochromatic finish differentiates the psychology of mother's pain. The other group in the lower register are the diseased on the left side of the composition, painted in very dark tones, among which a shape of a male figure stands out, shown from the back, with regular physiognomy. Analytical construction of the composition, where each individual segment creates an independent unit through interconnecting, makes the painting seem very deliberate. Apart from that, the skill in handling the brush when depicting anatomy, composition, and spatial relations indicates the work of a high-quality (probably Viennese) painter.

A significant memorial of the patronage activities of the family is related to the construction of the sculpture of St Florian in the centre of Donji Miholjac,⁶⁰ considering the low representation of sculptures in the context of the patronage activities of the family.⁶¹ The landowners donated the bricks for the construction of the sculpture in 1802, so the citizens would build a votive sculpture after several fires devastated the town.⁶² The sculpture was built by Joseph Buch,⁶³ it is solidly sculpted, and its recent restoration has provided the sculpture with multiple bright colours. A particularly interesting detail is the burning house and the thick smoke which negates the weight of the material and skilfully illustrates the appearance of smoke. Among the public monuments, sources also mention the engagement of the family during the construction of the small chapel sculpture of St Ana in Bistrinci, which was, motivated by the legend about that pilgrimage site⁶⁴, erected and maintained by Marija Ana Hilleprand von Prandau.⁶⁵

Another very significant monument, which was ordered, constructed, and equipped in full through the engagement of the family, more accurately the engagement of Julijana and Rudolf Normann-Ehrenfels, is the parish church of St Roch in Veliškovci (cat. no. 7, 12, MLU).⁶⁶ The complete liturgical furniture was ordered by the counts⁶⁷ at the workshops of

masters in Tirol. The workshop Insam&Prinot,⁶⁸ was hired to create the three side sculptures (of *St Aloysius Gonzaga*, *St Anthony of Padua*, and *an unknown saint*), all the other items (the main and two side altars, the pulpit, and three sculptures – of the *Sacred Heart of Jesus*, *St Joseph with the Baby Jesus*, *Baptism of Christ*) were made by the workshop of Ferdinand Stuflesser.⁶⁹ The sculpture of *St Joseph with the Baby Jesus* is somewhat larger, so it was probably decorating the side altar on the epistle side.⁷⁰ Today, the sculpture of the *Immaculate Heart of Mary* is on that altar, which is also its dedication, and the moment in which the patron of this altar changed is not known. Two stained glass windows in the sanctuary with the images of St Charles Borromeo and St Julijana were also ordered by the counts, which is pointed out by the text on those scenes. The altarpiece of the main altar, with the representation of St Roch, was painted by Mato Celestin Medović,⁷¹ and it too was ordered by Count Rudolf.⁷² The saint comprises the central compositional axis, with his left leg covered with a robe and a partially visible wound, his leg is slightly stepping forward, and his arms and gaze are lifted. On his right there is a dog with a piece of bread in its mouth. The painter used a light palette of earth colours, which he applied using quick and short brushstrokes, he shaped the volume with tone modulation, and he modulated the space. He had a very Modern approach to expressing sainthood, a modest young man is shown, the humanity of the figure of the old man is emphasized, in whose piety and contemplative calm there is evident spirituality. Petar II Antun ordered a painting of St Roch for the once-standing church in Veliškovci, then an affiliate of the Marijanci parish, but no trace of it was found.⁷³

Apart from the painting of St Roch in Veliškovci, according to written sources, Rudolf also made an order from another domestic artist, Dragan Melkus, for a painting of St John of Capistrano for one of the parishes in the Valpovo region.⁷⁴ It is interesting that this information was published in the local newspapers. Considering that the news report stated that the artist already started the painting,⁷⁵ we can assume that it was completed, but unfortunately its location has not been determined.

The families Hilleprand von Prandau and von Normann-Ehrenfels were very active patrons of art with highly developed art sensibilities. Their art and construction heritage is an example of the activities of Central European nobility in local areas, and as such it is also a significant episode in the context of European heritage. They have indebted numerous generations of residents of the areas in and around Valpovo, Miholjac, and Osijek with their patronage activities, by forming orders directly in the service of the estate, and indirectly for the needs of future generations. Today, the private family collection is a part of the holdings of museum institutions and it requires an ambivalent interpretation, as an independent private collection in the context of the time when it was collected and as a private collection which is a part of museum holdings in the modern context. It also enables the understanding of the lifestyle of the family, their habits, taste, and even individual personalities. The fine arts heritage of the family also consists of art that is not in the private collection, which was ordered by the members of the family, but not for the space of the castle. Most of those are within the religious objects on the estate, for which the families became patrons. Large orders of art, significant names, and the quantity and quality of art pieces, some of which are major pieces in the national heritage, speak in favour of the developed art sensibility and the refined tastes of the families Hilleprand von Prandau and von Normann-Ehrenfels, and the artwork connected to them is an unavoidable segment of every art review in this area today.

⁵⁶ Švajcer, O. mentioned work, 1991, p. 174.

⁵⁷ The engagement of the family in the construction of specific churches and chapels (parish and affiliates) indicates the possibility that the family was ordering some of their equipment.

⁵⁸ *„Imagine vero s. Caroli Borromaei sumptibus illustratissimi domini Caroli lib. baronis a Prandau procurata. Kanonske vizitacije. Knjiga III. Srijan, S. (ed.). Osijek : Državni arhiv u Osijeku ; Dakovo : Biskupija dakovačka i srijemska, 2005, p. 452. Considering that, according to the same citation, the church in Lacići was built in 1817, the painting is accordingly dated around 1820.*

⁵⁹ Common for the depictions of Charles Borromeo, who was very engaged with the diseased during the plague epidemics in his lifetime.

⁶⁰ In front of the parish church of St Michael today.

⁶¹ Srijan, S. (ed.). mentioned work, 2005, p. 346–349.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ *Signature on the monument: 1802. / Feicit Joseph Buch / V. Ecclesiis. No information about this master was found.*

⁶⁴ According to legend, the painting of St Ana floated in the Drava to that location. The saint is celebrated on that spot to commemorate that event. More in: Antolović, J. Duhovni velikani. Dio 2. Zagreb : Filozofsko-teološki institut Družbe Isusove, 1998, p. 111–112.

⁶⁵ Srijan, S. (ed.) mentioned work, 2005, p. 276–277. The small chapel statue was erected in 1797. Antolović, J. mentioned work, 1998, p. 111.

⁶⁶ See the text in this catalogue: Damjanović, D. Architecture of the Valpovo Estate in the 19th Century. In the sanctuary, above the entrance into the sacristy, there is a plaque with a coat of arms of the von Normann-Ehrenfels family and an engraved inscription: SAĞRA [coat of arms] DJEVNO / POD POKROVITELJSTVOM / RUDOLFA GROFJA NORMANNA / EHRENFELSKOG / VLASTELJNA VALPOVAČKOGA / G. 1901.-1902.

⁶⁷ The main altar painting of St Roch – original painting – from Medović (franciskane), coloured windows St Charles Borromeo and St Julijana, and a tasteful pulpit with one completely white vestments speak about how much in his (Rudolf's, author's note) heart is the beauty of the house of God. AA. VV. Povijest župe veliškovske. Rukopis. Arhiv župe Veliškovci, p. 5–6.

⁶⁸ The small plaques with the information on the author are on the bases of statues: *INSAM & PRINOTH / Institut für kirchliche Kunst / St. Ulrich in Gröden, Tirol, Austria.*

⁶⁹ The small plaques with the information on the author are on the bases of the sculptures, and the altars are signed on the sides. There are negligible variations in the details of the signature (e.g. the year is missing in some), but they all contain the same general information on the author: *Ferd. Stuflesser / Bildhauer Altarbauer / St. Ulrich Gröden Tirol / 1902.* Also, the archives of Stuflesser's workshops contains information on the order to furnish the church in Veliškovci within their files.

⁷⁰ I would like to thank Narcisa Dužević for granting me access to the materials in the Stuflesser archives and for the useful information.

⁷¹ *Signature d. d.: MC Medović*

⁷² See note 67.

⁷³ The painting is mentioned in the Canonical Visitations from 1745: *„mensa altaris ex tegulis super cum pulchra imago s. Rochi donata ab excel. baronis dom. terrestris; Srijan, S. (editor and translator) mentioned work, 2005, 48–49. Considering that during the previous visitation from 1738 the church patron was St Magdalene, there was a change in the patron during those seven years, so a new painting was probably ordered for that occasion. Ibid., p. 12–13.*

⁷⁴ *Narodna obrana, no. 28, 4 February 1914, Osijek : Prva hrvatska dionička tiskara u Osijeku, p. 2.*

I would like to thank my colleague Daniel Zec for his help.

⁷⁵ *Unjtenjnik je rad već otkočeo. Narodna obrana, br. 28, 4. veljače 1914., Osijek : Prva hrvatska dionička tiskara u Osijeku, p. 2.*